

REMARKS

At the outset, Applicants thank the Examiner for reviewing and considering the pending application. The Office Action dated October 13, 2006 has been received and reviewed. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3–9, 12, 13, 15–30, 34, 35, and 37–40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,195,647, issued to *Studt* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,799,647, issued to *Mills*. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration.

As set forth in Chapter 2143.03 of the MPEP, to establish prima facie obviousness of the claimed invention, all of the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. Applicants submit that *Studt* and *Mills*, singularly or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in each of the independent claims.

Independent claim 1 recites a door comprising, inter alia, “a door frame” and “an outer window ... wherein the door frame has a front surface curved in left/right directions, and the outer window is curved the same with the door frame.” Nothing in *Studt* and *Mills*, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests at least these features, as recited.

As acknowledged by the Office, *Studt* fails to disclose at least the aforementioned features. Applicants further submit that *Mills* fails to supply the deficiencies of *Studt*. Rather, *Mills* discloses that a “frame 18 is preferably made of a one-piece strip of metal or other flexible, bendable material which is bent into *the rectangular form* shown.” (*Mills*, col. 2, lines 11–13, *emphasis added*). That is, *Mills* contemplates the use of a flexible, bendable material for the purposes of extending around the periphery of rectangular window panels 14, 16. See *Mills* at Figure 2. *Mills*, however, does not contemplate the use of a bendable material to provide a “front surface curved in left/right directions,” as recited in the claims. This is further evidenced by the lack of any disclosure or suggestion in *Mills* regarding Applicants’ claimed features.

Mills also fails to disclose “an outer window that is curved...”, as recited. In contrast, *Mills* discloses that “[t]he [glass] panels 14 and 16 are of *identical rectangular size and shape* and are in spaced *parallel planes* ... [t]he top and bottom side edges of the two panels are

respectively in opposed *parallel relation* to one another, as are the right and left edges thereof.” (*Mills*, col. 2, lines 5–9, *emphasis added*). As such, *Mills*’ disclosure of parallel (i.e., flat) plates is inconsistent with the claimed features of an “outer window [that] is curved the same with the door frame.”

Applicants further traverse the Office’s assertions that the “the frame *may obviously be* bent for achieving aesthetic purposes such as curvature in the left/right directions” and that “although the window of *Mills* is rectangular, it *may* embody a flat or curved surface.” See page 3 of the Office Action. As aforementioned, *Mills* does not suggest, inter alia, a frame having a curved “front surface,” particularly in the “left/right directions.” Moreover, there is no supporting motivation for the desirability of such features in *Mills*. Furthermore, allegations that a frame/window *could be* curved and/or that such features are within the *capability* of one of ordinary skill are not sufficient to establish a prima facie case of obviousness without some objective reason for the proposed modification. See MPEP 2143.01. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection, as the Office is clearly using impermissible hindsight to arrive at the Applicants’ claimed invention.

Furthermore, it appears as if the Office’s arguments, presented on page 4 of the Office Action, are based on the Office’s example, illustrated on page 3 of the Office Action, which is neither disclosed nor suggested by *Mills*. As shown in Figure 2, *Mills* clearly discloses two flat, rectangular panels 14, 16 and not the curved front surface depicted by the Examiner on page 3 of the Office Action.

Additionally, Applicants submit that there is no motivation for the proposed combination of *Studt* and *Mills*. Specifically, *Studt* discloses that the door panel has a “thin upper door portion to provide maximum volume within the dryer 10.” (*Mills*, column 6, lines 9–24). Accordingly, modifying *Studt* to include *Mills*’ pair of rectangular windows would destroy *Studt*’s intended teachings of providing “a thin upper door portion to provide maximum volume within a dryer.” Further, the inclusion of a pair of rectangular windows, as disclosed by *Mills*, on the door panel 50 of *Studt* would interfere with *Studt*’s inner liner 52, which is essential to the therein disclosed invention.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 and the dependent claims 3–9, 12–13, 15–30, 34–35, and 37 are allowable over the combination of *Studt* and *Mills*.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of independent claim 38 and request reconsideration. Independent claim 38 is allowable in that it recites “a door frame,” and “an outer window ... wherein the door frame has a front surface curved in left/right directions, and the outer window is curved the same with the door frame.” Nothing in *Studt* and *Mills*, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, for the same or similar reasons as those regarding claim 1 above, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 38, and its dependent claim 39, are allowable over the combination of *Studt* and *Mills*.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of independent claim 40 and request reconsideration. Independent claim 40 is allowable in that it recites “a door frame,” and “an outer window ... wherein the door frame has a curved outer surface, and the outer window is curved such that the curve of the outer window conforms to the curve of the outer surface of the door frame.” Nothing in *Studt* and *Mills*, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, for the same or similar reasons as those regarding claim 1 above, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 40 is allowable over the combination of *Studt* and *Mills*.

In the Office Action, claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Studt* and *Mills*, and further in view of EP 0 851 177 (hereinafter *Faccoli*). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration. Claims 10 and 11, which depend from independent claim 1, are allowable because *Faccoli* fails to cure the deficiency of *Studt* and *Mills* to teach or suggest the feature of claim 1 discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 10 and 11, as they depend from independent claim 1, are allowable over the combination of *Studt*, *Mills*, and *Faccoli*.

In the Office Action, claims 14 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Studt* and *Mills*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,109,277, issued to *Linton*. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 14 and request reconsideration. Claim 14, which depends from independent claim 1, is allowable because *Linton* fails to cure the

deficiency of *Studt* and *Mills* to teach or suggest the feature of claim 1 discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 14, as it depends from independent claim 1, is allowable over the combination of *Studt*, *Mills*, and *Linton*.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 36 and request reconsideration. Claim 36, which depends from independent claim 1, is allowable because *Linton* fails to cure the deficiency of *Studt* and *Mills* to teach or suggest the feature of claim 1 discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 36, as it depends from independent claim 1, is allowable over the combination of *Studt*, *Mills*, and *Linton*.

In the Office Action, claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Studt* and *Mills*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,223,276, issued to *Gebhardt*. Claim 31, which depend from independent claim 1, is allowable because *Gebhardt* fails to cure the deficiency of *Studt* and *Mills* to teach or suggest the feature of claim 1 discussed above.

In the Office Action, claims 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Studt* and *Mills*, and further in view of *Gebhardt*. Claim 32-33, which depend from independent claim 1, are allowable because *Gebhardt* fails to cure the deficiency of *Studt* and *Mills* to teach or suggest the feature of claim 1 discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 32-33, as they depend from independent claim 1, are allowable over the combination of *Studt*, *Mills*, and *Gebhardt*.

Applicants believe the present application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the

filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: January 9, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Mark R. Kresloff

Registration No.: 42,766

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant